



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Daniel E. ALES et al.

Serial No. 09/920,860

Art Unit: 3767

Filed: August 3, 2001

Examiner: Gray, Phillip A.

For: NEEDLE SAFETY DEVICE
WITH TORTUOUS PATH

Atty Docket: 0100/0129

PETITION FILED PURSUANT TO 37 CFR 1.181(a)(3)

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:


This Petition is filed along with the Request to Reinstate the Appeal for this case, and in particular to request the Group Director to order the examiner to respond with an Examiner's Answer and forward this case to the Board of Appeals for adjudication in light of the following:

1. This application was filed on August 3, 2001 with claims 1-26.
2. In response to a Restriction Requirement dated September 6, 2002, applicants elect for prosecution claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-20 and 22-26.
3. In response to an Office Action dated November 13, 2002, an amendment was filed on February 12, 2003. Typographical errors and claim 6 were amended in the amendment.
4. In response to a final rejection Office Action dated May 6, 2003, a first Notice of Appeal was filed on July 25, 2003.

US/06/2008 SZEVDIE1 00000009 500501 09920860

01 FC:1464 130.03 DA

Adjustment date: 05/30/2008 SDIRETA1
05/06/2008 SZEVDIE1 00000009 500501 09920860
01 FC:1464 130.00 CR



DEF 3 REF

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

2008 MAY 28 PM 4: 26

Daniel E. ALES et al.

Serial No. 09/920,860

Art Unit: 3767

Filed: August 3, 2001

Examiner: Gray, Phillip A.

For: NEEDLE SAFETY DEVICE
WITH TORTUOUS PATH

Atty Docket: 0100/0129

REQUEST FOR REFUND


Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

On May 5, 2008 a Petition and Petition Fee of \$130.00 were submitted to the U.S. PTO for the above-identified application. Per the Decision dated May 20, 2008 granting the Petition, it was noted that "No fee is required for this petition. The petition fee paid may be refunded upon request." See attached Decision on Petition.

The undersigned hereby requests a refund \$130.00 to be credited to Deposit Account 50-0501.

Respectfully submitted,



Louis Woo, Reg. No. 31,730
Law Offices of Louis Woo
717 North Fayette Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Phone: (703) 299-4090

Date: May 22, 2008



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Daniel E. ALESI et al.

Serial No. 09/920,860

Art Unit: 3767

Filed: August 3, 2001

Examiner: Gray, Phillip A.

For: NEEDLE SAFETY DEVICE
WITH TORTUOUS PATH

Atty Docket: 0100/0129

REQUEST FOR REFUND

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

On May 5, 2008 a Petition and Petition Fee of \$130.00 were submitted to the U.S. PTO for the above-identified application. Per the Decision dated May 20, 2008 granting the Petition, it was noted that "No fee is required for this petition. The petition fee paid may be refunded upon request." See attached Decision on Petition.

The undersigned hereby requests a refund \$130.00 to be credited to Deposit Account 50-0501.

Respectfully submitted,

Louis Woo, Reg. No. 31,730
Law Offices of Louis Woo
717 North Fayette Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Phone: (703) 299-4090

Date: May 22, 2008



0.50
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

LOUIS WOO
LAW OFFICE OF LOUIS WOO
717 NORTH FAYETTE STREET
ALEXANDRIA VA 22314

In re Application of:

Alesi, Daniel E. et al

Serial No.: 09/920,860

Filed: Aug. 3, 2001

Docket: 0100/0129

Title: NEEDLE SAFETY DEVICE WITH
TORTUOUS PATH

DECISION ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition filed on May 5, 2008 seeking to forward the case to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for adjudication. This petition is being considered pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.181(a) (3). No fee is required for this petition. The petition fee paid may be refunded upon request.

The petition is Granted.

In the petition, the petitioner requests that the Director to direct the examiner to consider the appeal brief filed on May 5, 2005 and forward the application to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for final resolution.

The record shows that:

- 1) In response to the applicant's amendment of Feb. 12, 2003, on May 6, 2003 the examiner mailed a final Office action.
- 2) On Jul. 25, 2003, the petitioner filed a notice of appeal followed with an appeal brief on Sep. 22, 2003, appealing the claims under final rejection.
- 3) On Mar. 16, 2004, the examiner issued a non-final Office action maintaining the rejection, but reopening the prosecution of the case.
- 4) On Jun. 15, 2004, the petitioner filed a new notice of appeal and a second appeal brief.
- 5) On Jul. 6, 2007, the examiner issued another non-final Office action maintaining the rejection, but reopening the prosecution of the case.
- 6) On Oct. 1, 2007, the petitioner filed third notice of appeal and third appeal brief.
- 7) On Feb. 5, 2008, the examiner issued another non-final Office action maintaining the rejection, but reopening the prosecution of the case.

- 8) On May 5, 2008, the petitioner filed fourth notice of appeal and fourth appeal brief.
- 9) On May 5, 2008 the present petition was filed requesting the examiner to forward the case to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for its adjudication.

Discussion and Analysis

A review of the application reveals that there is a prolonged prosecution in this case. The application history also shows the examiner reopened prosecution three times. Office policy requires examiners to complete a thorough prior art search, and avoid piecemeal examination as much as possible. Office policy discourages piece meal prosecution as set forth in M.P.E.P. §707.07(g)¹. Regrettably due to late discovery of prior art, prosecution of the applicant's invention has been unavoidably prolonged. It should be noted that the Primary Examiner has a duty to consider the merits of the claims under M.P.E.P. § 1004. In order to avoid re-opening prosecution, the examiner is reminded to perform a complete and thorough search of prior art considering not only the claims presented, but also any subject matter the examiner reasonably anticipates might be incorporated into a subsequent amendment in accordance with M.P.E.P. 904.03².

In response to the petition, the examiner is hereby instructed to timely set up an appeal conference in accordance with M.P.E.P. §1207.01. Additionally, the examiner is also directed to conclude the examination of the application as soon as possible.

Conclusion

Under the circumstances, the relief requested by the petitioner is granted. The application is being forwarded to the Supervisory Patent Examiner in Art Unit 3767 for consideration of the appeal brief filed on May 5, 2008. Any inquiry regarding this decision should be directed to Henry Yuen, Special Programs Examiner, at (571) 272-4856.

Petition Granted.



Frederick R. Schmidt, Director
Technology Center 3700

¹ M.P.E.P. § 707.07(g) states: Piecemeal examination should be avoided as much as possible. The examiner ordinarily should reject each claim on all valid grounds available, avoiding, how-ever, undue multiplication of references

² M.P.E.P. § 904.03 states in relevant part: "It is normally not enough that references be selected to meet only the terms of the claims alone, especially if only broad claims are presented; but the search should, insofar as possible, also cover all subject matter which the examiner reasonably anticipates might be incorporated into applicant's amendment."